

**BLET REVISION COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
July 11, 2014
Fayetteville Police Department Training Center
Fayetteville, NC**

Jennifer Fisher called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. and thanked Craig Worley, Fayetteville PD, for hosting the July 11, 2014 BLET Revision Committee meeting. Members and guests introduced themselves. Janet Dunn called the roll.

Members Present:

Mack Creson
Craig Worley
Jason Godwin
Wrenn Johnson
Wayne Lamm
Jeffrey Robinson
Randy Shepherd
Daniel Little (representing Sammy Turner)
Steve Warren
Trevor Allen, CJ Standards Division

Members Absent:

Nancy Bennett
Louis Ingram
Sammy Turner (proxy representation)

Ex-Officio Members Present:

Lauren Earnhardt, NC Department of Justice

Ex-Officio Members Absent:

Julia Lohman, Sheriffs' Standards Division
Autumn Hanna, Sheriffs' Standards Division
Steve Combs, CJ Standards Division

Staff Present:

Jennifer Fisher, NC Justice Academy
Janet Dunn, NC Justice Academy
Mark Strickland, NC Justice Academy
John Combs, NC Justice Academy
Gary Dudley, NC Justice Academy
Stacy Holloman, NC Justice Academy
Nicole Tyler, NC Justice Academy/Intern
Rick Brown, NC Justice Academy/NC Dept. of Justice
Paige Phillips, NC Justice Academy/NC Dept. of Justice

Visitors Present:

Brandon Zuidema, Garner Police Department
Ray Williams, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department
Michael Adams, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department
Glenn Johns, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department
Chris Davis, Fayetteville Police Department
Tracy McPherson, NC Community Colleges
Nathan Mizzell, Nash Community College

OLD BUSINESS

Curriculum Revisions: POPAT Project (John Combs)

A new packet of handouts were provided by Mrs. Fisher – updated Cooper Institute forms, the norms that are presently included in BLET have been updated, in a newer format. Handouts were provided to the committee members; *State of North Carolina Department of Justice Police Officer Physical Ability Test Final Validation Report (POPAT)*, Work Physiology Associates, Inc., 2014 (which also included the Appendices); *Police Officer Physical Abilities Test, Student Evaluation Form*; and the minutes from the July 1, 2014 POPAT Steering Committee meeting.

Assessment Protocol handout: Mr. Combs, accompanied by Mr. Glenn Jones, addressed the Committee regarding the Assessment Protocol packet. The packet has not been changed, other than updating the Cooper norms. Specifically, the body fat and cardiovascular is updated every 5 years, and having 2013 updates on the charts, these were included to make sure the most current information is provided. Protocol and equipment requirements remain the same.

POPAT: Mr. Combs advised that he has a video of the POPAT demonstration that will be shown later in the discussion. A review of the POPAT Report was conducted:

- **Page 4: General validation process outline**
Report provides an overview of the actual validation process that was followed in an outline format. Steps were taken to ensure that this was a scientifically valid test that is defensible.
- **Page 5: Phases I and II**
Once the new task analysis was done, identification of critical job functions resulted in several changes to the physical abilities which required changes to the POPAT. A committee was formed, the validation expert identified, and work began deciding what to test on, in what order, and the degree of difficulty, ensuring that testing was being conducted on as many areas as possible in order to have a good comprehensive job abilities test.
- **Page 6:** Outlines the instructions that were received based upon the 2008 job task analysis; and **Page 7** outlines those tasks that were considered for simulation in POPAT. Participant Outfitting: Recommendation is for standard, duty-style uniform; t-shirt is fine, police pants or BDU-style pants, good supportive shoes, ballistic vest to be worn on the outside of the shirt. Recommendation to eliminate the duty gear or duty belt since it is a testing environment (simulation). Partially through the testing phase, participants starting receiving injuries; bruising, scrapes, and cuts. So, the recommendation is regular standard belt.
- **Page 8: Course location**
Recommendation to allow indoor with adequate spacing (recommendations placed within the appendix) or outside, e.g., grass, concrete, or asphalt.

- **Page 10:** A final overview is listed in more detail in the appendix.
- **Page 11: Phase 3: Determine Minimal Level of Competency – Incumbent Testing and Survey Results (chart) – Collection of times data**
Explains how the committee went about the testing process and how it was determined the degree of difficulty. Job task analysis does not identify a particular degree of difficulty. Incumbent Testing: 185 incumbent officers were tested (experienced individuals) and obtained feedback as to what they thought of the test and how it related to the job and the degree of difficulty. Also obtained feedback via survey of what they thought would be an appropriate time that an individual with 16 weeks of training should minimally be able to complete the POPAT. The data does not include the physical fitness instructors that were also tested so as not to skew testing results. The average age of incumbents was 36.9, range 23-61, and average work experience of 12.2 years, range of 1 year to 27 years' experience; 48 females of 185 tested (25.9%)/137 males (74.1%). Officers were presented with a post-test survey; rate how the test compared with the job; how the test rated with the intensity – how difficult was the test compared to the difficulty of the job? Officers were asked, in their opinion, to provide a minimally acceptable level following 16 weeks of BLET training. Ratings were broken down; intensity one, intensity two, intensity three. Across the board, 83% rated it as similar to the job. Between male and female, there is no statistical difference in how they rated the test as compared to the job. They all indicate that the intensity level is very similar. **Scenario 2:** The Rescue Scenario: Received very good feedback with over 80% rating it as similar to the job. **Similarity of the tests:** Scenario 1 – Scale rating of 1 to 5; 5 = very similar / 1 = not at all.
- **Page 13: Rescue Scenario:** Contains the breakdown as the previous scenario.
- **Page 14:** Kept track of the roll drill and pushups. The average proposed cut-off times recommended, once the responses were analyzed and averaged, are shown at the bottom of page 14.
- **Page 15** notes the formula used. Once the officers completed the test, the actual times were recorded as well as their proposed times as to what they feel a BLET individual, who had been through the training, should be able to complete this test to be minimally successful and graduate. Subtract the suggested times from the actual times. Rank order, eliminating the top and bottom 10%, averaging out the remaining and that gives you a proposed cut-off time. The first scenario had a dropdown time of 6 minutes or less for passing, and 3 minutes or less for the second scenario. It worked out statistically to 5:58 and 2:50, but they were rounded up for ease of administration and timing.

***Question:** Are these incumbents coming from agencies that already have some kind of physical fitness requirement, meaning that they have to do the POPAT or Coopers test every year or so in order for them to continue working, or are these incumbents from a variety of agencies where fitness is not necessarily required?*
Response: The only one with the incumbents that we tested that had to do anything at all would have been Charlotte and that was a participatory kind of a test; it's not anything that their incumbent officers are required to pass. . . . But, none that I am aware of had any kind of fitness requirement.
- **Page 16** contains the reliability data to ensure the test is reliable and going to get similar results across the board with similar groups. Retested approximately 25%. Mr. Glenn Jones added that, essentially, it means that if an individual performed the test in 4 minutes today, it would be expected that the same individual would perform the test the following day in about the same amount of time again.

- **Page 17: Impact Testing:** The impact testing stage included recruit trainees in various stages of their training that had no training or knowledge of the new POPAT. Statistically, for scenario 1, 11% failed, 89% passed. Second table provides the general time range; ranging from 2:40 to over 10 minutes. Bottom of page 17: Explains table 5 on the impact issue. Once the test is implemented, it is expected that the pass rates will significantly increase, especially once they have had a chance to train, toward the end of their BLET training – POPAT is meant to be an end of BLET test. During BLET, individuals will have an opportunity to practice it and have a chance to run through it.
- **Page 18:** Addresses the recommendations and the type of validation that was used. It contains a general overview of the final write-up on the first report and the appendix.

Question: You are saying eventually as they train more, that they'll actually get better, meaning that the 71% should increase closer to the male? Is that the vision or the goal; that the 22% difference will actually, with training, improve?

Response (John Combs): “We certainly think so and, scenario two was right at 80%, scenario one was about 71% and again, you’re looking at folks that have never gone through it before, never trained before on the particular test. As everybody here is aware, certainly when I was running BLET classes, it was not unusual for me on the first time people ran the current POPAT, to have half of the class fail. I don’t think I had a failure the whole time I was running BLET and run the POPAT, so we will expect that to improve, not just to improve, I think it will improve by a lot.” Recruits who are struggling or are going to struggle or likely not pass the current POPAT, they probably are going to have the same level of trouble with the new one and vice versa. If recruits are not going to struggle or you anticipate are not going to have a problem with the current POPAT, they very likely are not going to have trouble passing this one. Mr. Glenn Jones added, once the videos are shown, the times that are being suggested are not unachievable.

While viewing the video, using the course diagram, Scenario #1 (Appendix C) and Scenario 2 on the next page, will help explain how the course is run. **Showing Video/Scenario 1 – Chase and Apprehension scenario.** The individual completing the course on the video was able to complete it in 3:49 minutes. (Stopped for questions)

Clarification: The pushups are just like with the current POPAT, they do not have to be continuous? Response: Yes, they can stop and rest, just remembering the time keeps going. Instructors are allowed to guide them through, tell them what to do. They just can’t provide any type of physical assistance.

Clarification: Under #2, it says “run 120 feet while encountering the obstacles.” So, the relationship between the obstacles will vary, it’s just total distance? Response: No, if you look at the diagram, Appendix C, it gives you the location of the obstacles along the course.

Showing Video/Scenario 2 – Rescue scenario. (Stopped video for explanation) In regards to the dummy drag, there is no specific way to perform the technique. Granted, an appendage drag is not ideal; however, for testing, it provides an option of how the dummy might be moved. The dummy weighs 175 lbs. Mr. Jones added this is different from the previous study that had been done over 10 years ago where it was 150 lbs., but is now allowed up to 200 lbs. So, the 175 is a midline between 150 and the maximum 200. (Video restarted)

The individual completing the course on the video was able to complete it in 1:35 minute. The new form, check-off list, is included in the Appendix as well. The new score sheet is also included in the packet. The Physical Abilities Test, Post-Course form that the school directors will complete to send to Training Standards. This will be the avenue of how the data will be maintained; pass/fail, male/female, etc. will continue to be tracked and reviewed periodically.

Question: *Are the students to do both scenarios back to back or will that have a rest period in-between?*

Response: There is a mandatory minimum of 10 minutes rest you have to give them between the two. And, it has to be done within the same training day. Minimum 10 minutes, maximum 2 hours. Wayne Lamm expressed his concern of the times being uniform and that this amount of gap could make a difference. There is concern about the time, but its mainly acknowledging the logistics that some facilities testing a large number of people at one time, they can only test one individual at a time, so to try to hit it at exactly 10 minutes could be taxing.

Testing was performed at:

- ❖ Charlotte-Mecklenburg
- ❖ Brunswick Community College
- ❖ Fayetteville Police Dept.
- ❖ Durham Community College
- ❖ Mitchell Community College
- ❖ Cape Fear Community College

Similar results across the board; half were performed indoors, half outdoors. Two on grass, one on asphalt and the others inside a gym area (like that on the video). Not much disparity between the testing locations.

Question: *What is the proposal for failure at the end of BLET; keeping it 120 days?*

Response: I think that is a Training Standards issue, but to my knowledge is yes, and for failure is if they fail one scenario or the other, pass the first one – fail the second one, the idea is the remediation and retesting requirements would be the same per Training Standards as far as developing the deficiency, but our recommendation is that they retest on both scenarios since it is still meant to be one test even though we are actually tracking two separate times. Mr. Trevor Allen interjected, the way that the rule is written is that when we say pass or fail, the test is encompassing of all of the parts of the test combined. If we kept the rule the same, it would mean that you would have to do both parts again.

Question: *Concerned going away knowing that 71% (protected class), are you okay with knowing that a test would show 71% of the females on Scenario 1 passed?*

Response: More than 71% passed, that was the pass rate compared with the males; compared to the male pass rate. In other words, it wasn't a female 20 – 30% failure rate, it was their pass rate compared with the male pass rate. *93% of the males would still pass that same test compared to 71% of the females; am I correct?* Mr. Jones added, "You are right. It was 71% actually passed. A couple things on that; (1) it was a fairly small sample size – given the typical class don't have that many females in it, it's just hard for us to get. With a small sample size, you just change one person passing, that changes the percentage quite a bit, and so, the numbers can be a little bit deceiving sometimes. Let's say conservatively, you took, we had 22 pass, and 9 fail on the first part. Let's say conservatively, three of those that failed, passed. Now you have well over 80% pass rate. I think that's a real conservative estimate that many more would pass." Typically, most schools would give one, if not several, practice runs of the POPAT over the course of BLET. Various stages of BLET students were tested as well. It is reasonable to expect that out of those tested, two or three out of the 9 passing toward the end, and then it's not an issue. Mr. Jones noted that with the first scenario, especially with the bag roll, there is a technique issue; males can muscle it, but smaller individuals when coached about wrapping their legs around it, they get a lot quicker at it with just a little coaching. Improvement was seen from one set to the next; once they realized that there was a little technique to it.

Question: *Some community colleges will be doing it outside because they don't have a gym, if a wooden wall is erected, and erected a low crawl, as long as it is kept within the specifications, is that going to be good?*

Response: As far as I know, that was the recommendation. The only things that were recommended that are required are the dummy, just so it is standardized since they can vary, and the roll bag. It was designed in such a way that if you don't have the space, you could make it portable. As long as the specifications, heights and measurements of the fence and low crawl are met, I don't think that's an issue at all.

Question: *It is not going to be like it is now, where when we go through the 5-year accreditation auditors come in and measure everything, if it is within an inch or two you are going to get written up. So, it is going to be going back on the school director to make sure it is set up correctly?*

Response: Right, and we did that because if you manufacture or order it, sometimes it's not going to be exactly and once you set it up, there is going to be some variance, so we wanted to build that in, plus or minus three inches with the fence and low crawl in case that were to happen. Mr. Jones directed the members to Appendix E, which specifies this.

Question: *What is the specification on the top of the fence?*

Response: Yes, it says 4-foot fence, +/- 3 inches from the top.

Question: *What about the material?*

Response: No, we did not specify.

Question: *Is a wooden wall with a 14" piece of carpet across the top of it appropriate?*

Response: The fence in the video came from the manufacture with a plastic covering that sits over top of the fence. I wouldn't think that there would be an issue with that.

Mr. Mark Strickland addressed the concern with the bag roll and that with coaching of clenching the knees around the bag made a huge difference in the student(s) performance. Concerns expressed surrounding the original POPAT numbers for males passing compared to females passing. Are you comfortable after the comparison between the two; the original POPAT compared to the new POPAT? Could this be creating a possible argument; can it be defended? Mr. Strickland noted that there are two different tests so it is very hard to compare numbers from many years ago to current. Point is well taken. Mr. Jones added if the female pass rate up to above 80% of the male rate, which really believe is going to happen, then legally, their initial claim is weak at that point. Ms. Lauren Earnhardt advised that there is no discrimination; all individuals are being treated the same. They are looking at the impact when you have numbers like this for females passing at a lower rate. You then look at if the requirement for all applicants is a job-related function, which it is, and then the protected class would have to show that there is a less-discriminatory option/alternative to whatever portion is causing them to fail. Ms. Earnhardt has recommended that data collection continue to monitor the female pass rate to see if it increases like is believed it will. That will show that there is no legal concern and there is evidence and statistics to back it up. If a problem arises, changes will be made.

Question: *Are we positive that this test is measuring what the job task analysis says it needs to measure?*

Response: That was why we did the survey that the incumbent officers going through it; their analysis of is this test similar to the job? Relating it to the task analysis, the items that were selected to include in the test were taken directly from the task analysis.

Question: *How do you defend a small sample size for females? It seems like a small sample size for males and females.*

Response: Statistically, it was not a bad overall sample size. When we project out to, based on the number of recruits that go through the Academy in a typical year, it was pretty good, but that is why the recommendation was made to continue to analyze the data.

Question: *So we all are comfortable with the job validity of the job task analysis and with the*

sample size?

Response: We are.

Mr. Combs was pleased with the results from the incumbents and the recruits without having seen the statistical analysis of the data. With the raw data he had collected, he was very pleased with the performance, especially after no demonstration of the course was conducted, just verbal instructions, before they performed the test. There were still pass rates, so he feels comfortable with the current test. Age differences don't seem to have much affect either.

Question: *Is the 30 steps to simulate going up three flights of stairs? And, if so, why change it from the current stairs that most schools have, as it seems more realistic to do that up and down.*

Response: Portability – in order to be able to set the test up at any location. Logistically, indoors, it is almost impossible to move those kinds of stairs around. And, even if those stairs may be a little more realistic, it's not a great simulation going up three flights of stairs versus going up and down here either; neither of them are perfect. *The up/down 30 times isn't really that close to going up three flights of stairs.* It was felt that it was just as taxing physiologically.

Question: *Regarding surveying of the incumbents, did those incumbent officers have any expectation that they would have to go through this test and could that have played into their opinion that they thought it was realistic or not?*

Response: They were told upfront what the purpose of the study was and how the test would be applied, that it was going to be a replacement for the end of training testing that currently exists. We had no time at that point, which is the whole purpose of having them run through and recommend times. At the time we did the incumbent study, there was nothing, there was no time, no suggested time – this was done to try to actually get one. Incumbents were told to simply do their best and give good honest feedback on the survey. From there, statistically people were able to get the drop-down times that are shown. *What was the actual time, the incumbents that went through it? Was it close to the six and three minute cutoffs or was it well under?* Their average times were well under that.

Mr. Jones: What has not held up well in court is when you run a group of individuals through and then pick some random number, selecting that as the cutoff with no real reason as to why that number is the cutoff. It is much more defensible with what has been done here. An expert group, individuals who do the actual job, goes through the test and gives their opinion of what is necessary in order to be able to say you can do the job.

Question: *Appendix E states that if it is done indoors, is there any unobstructed or variance on that? If there is a mat room at the end of a wide hallway, that they can do their run in the hallway, and step through a door to a mat room that is 10-feet away from the chair. Any variance at all; does it have to be absolutely unobstructed room size?*

Response: That recommendation was generally what was found if you want to set up both scenarios that the amount of room you likely need. As far the specifics of your suggestion, that would probably have to be a Training Standards issue. Mr. Allen added that he was envisioning the recommendations in some format that the school directors could look at as a checklist; it has to have this variance and these mandatory things, etc. for us to be able to inspect it for audit purposes.

Steve Warren made a **motion** to accept the new POPAT, the curriculum changes that support the POPAT, the new handouts, as well as the POPAT re-validation report to be supplemental information for the instructor and the new video. **Jason Godwin seconded.**

Mr. Strickland added that also for consideration is the effective date of January 1, 2015. Discussions among members ensued concerning the effective date and the availability of purchasing the required equipment.

Question: *What is the timeline of moving through E&T to allow school directors to buy the mandated equipment?*

Response: In March, Commissioner McPherson sent out an email concerning a tentative equipment list in an effort to begin preparations. Commissioner McPherson added that she sent all the school directors information suggesting that they set aside a certain amount of money, but did not include a detailed list of items for fear that school directors may start ordering the equipment before it is finalized. *If all school directors begin ordering at the same time, will there be a problem of a backlog, backorders, etc.?* There are two items that are required. The fence and low crawl come from one vendor, but it can be built on-site by the colleges. A vendor was mandated for two specific items, those actually used in testing, the dummy and the roll bag. This was done for standardization since the data was collected using those specific types of equipment and it would be difficult to allow others without altering the test.

Question: *What would be the date of final approval?*

Response: August 22nd (E&T meeting) – giving four months to get everything ready for January 1.

Question: *When would be the deadline for having the POPAT in place?*

Response: Mr. Strickland stated that he would think by the end of the course when they test.

Question: *Would that be part of the accreditation?*

Response: It would be and if the school was audited during that time, and this was in place, it would be audited on what's required. *That could happen on day one?* It would depend on the schedule; it could.

Question: *If everyone orders at the same time, what is that going to do to the vendor?*

Response: Mr. Strickland responded that we could reach out to the vendor and inform them that they are about to receive an order of these items. We can make the phone call and inform the vendor.

Question: *How do we ensure that the study is still going to be continuous in reference to making sure that what is theorized today is actually reality? I agree we need to get more data. But, how do we ensure that that is actually going to happen? When do we, at some point and time, say our theory works – great; you have a solid product. Or, it's not what we thought and we need to make some slight changes.*

Comment: Seems like there has been some miscommunication. As early as three months ago when the meeting was held, the committee was told basically that there is no way to get through all the committees and everything to begin January 1. Did not think that it would happen. So, we have time to look at it and think about it, and now, we are back at January 1. Lack of knowledge makes planning more difficult.

Question: *Recommending that PT instructors successfully complete it?*

Response: (John Combs) That was discussed in our committee. The plan is to offer updates after August, as soon as we know for sure this was going to be passed after E&T is to start offering a series of updates and I'm envisioning anywhere from a two to three-hour day where they would come in to discuss, receive the same paperwork the Revision committee received, see the video, have a chance to run through it if they wanted, but whether the updates are going to be made mandatory or instructors are going to have to pass, I think that's outside of my decision. The idea is to make the updates available to make sure we get as many current instructors in the field trained as quickly as possible. Would perform updates across the state as well.

Question: *The current POPAT course, the instructor must demo the POPAT.*

Response: (John Combs) This was added to the instructors note for BLET and for the course management guide that instructors still have to demonstrate the entire course in front of the students prior to any final testing. Basically the same rule that is in place now.

Question: *The instructor update, is that something that will go into the calendar?*

Response: No, that will be sent out to our PT instructors and school directors.

Commissioner McPherson asked for clarification for outfitting, specifically changes to the current requirements. The current POPAT required the duty belt with the gear; however, the new POPAT would not. There is no specific vendor for the vests; these can be donated, surplus, etc.

Question: *(Jennifer Fisher directed to John Combs) Found a note, "We must fully explain, demonstrate, and successfully complete by the PT instructors" in the handouts. I would like, if it's okay with you, to add that to the instructor notes in the lesson plan as well. I don't see that we have it in there.*

Response: Okay, absolutely. That would be a good idea.

Discussions were held regarding the consideration of a different start date (March 1, 2015; August 1, 2015; etc.) to assist the community colleges with purchasing mandatory equipment. Commissioner McPherson has volunteered to aid the colleges in stressing the need to purchase the new equipment.

Mr. Strickland informed the BLET Revision Committee that there was a POPAT Steering Committee that consisted of four members; two from CJ Commission, appointed by Chief Wrenn Johnson (Robin Pendergraft and Tim Ledford), and two from Sheriffs' Standards (David Edwards and Juan Vaughan). It was also their recommendation for January 1st. They want to see this move forward.

Mr. Warren expressed a concern over the number of vests and the ability to properly sanitize them. Mr. Combs and Mr. Jones advised that there was no specification to the number of vests needed. However, they did advise that they felt a few would be sufficient. Wearing them over the shirt is recommended for sanitation reasons. The vests do not have to be specific as to whether they have side panels or plates; just a standard vest for testing purposes.

Steven Warren made a **motion** to change the implementation date from January 1 to March 1. Not seconded.

Jason Godwin made the **motion** to accept the January 1, 2015 implementation date, curriculum changes, video changes, POPAT test changes, all inclusive with the minor changes of adding instructor note to demonstrate and course management guide. **Steve Warren seconded.**

Jeffrey Robinson added an **amendment to the motion** that testing will continue and there will be a timeline set so that we can ensure validation even more of the test. Mr. Strickland asked Jason Godwin if he accepted the amendment. Jason Godwin agreed.

Mr. Combs added that it was recommended that there be a one and two year impact analysis done. This was put in place to collect the data from the post-course forms that will be sent to Training Standards. That form has already been designed/developed by Glenn Jones and Trevor Allen. Again, the one and two year period, we will be looking at further impact analyses to make sure that there is no disparate impact.

Question: *Mr. Robinson, was your amendment to the motion asking for more testing before January 1?*

Response: No. Actually, since we have 'til January 1, is that too much to even ask, as they are preparing for it, could there be other studies done? Not just say that we will start January 1, and I

have no problem with January 1, but that's a great time since every academy will start probably in July, at least at the community college standpoint. That's more data that could be collected. Mr. Strickland added that was the recommendation of the steering committee. Mr. Combs added that if any schools wanted to volunteer until ... obviously they have to do the current POPAT until January 1 and test on it, but any school that wanted to go ahead and get the equipment set up and I could do a special instructional session for them, and give them time to practice and run through, each school that wanted to volunteer to do that and give us more opportunity to collect even more data, we would definitely be behind them. And, that was recommended.

Jennifer Fisher: Any further discussion – All in favor (raise hand):

- Jason Godwin
- Wayne Lamm
- Mack Creson
- Randy Shephard
- Steve Warren
- Daniel Little (representing Sammy Turner)
- Jeffrey Robinson
- Craig Worley
- Wrenn Johnson

Motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS

New Committee Member Appointment

Whitney Hendrix is going to be the new legal counsel representative. She replaces David Schick. Ms. Hendrix was unable to attend; however, Rick Brown and Paige Phillips attended in her place.

DIVISIONS' REPORTS

Criminal Justice Standards Division Report (Trevor Allen)

- Will be hiring for the BLET Program Administrator position.
- School Directors' conference will be held in Clemmons August 14th with optional August 15th for guest speakers. Attorney General plans to attend.
- Removing exams from commission curriculum – had a public hearing at the August 21st meeting on 20 rules impacted by this and voted on at the full commission. Effective date at least October 1st. It specifically maintains the responsibility for school directors and BLET and SMI courses to coordinate and schedule exams. It only removes that specific responsibility for the general and specialized instructor classes. It does remove the hours of the test from the curriculum. Also revised is the time period for testing – proposed and voted upon is a 60-day time limit to test and if there is a failure, they will have to retest with an additional 60-days.

Legal Counsel's Report (Rick Brown/Paige Phillips)

- Whitney Hendrix is the new legal counsel representative for the BLET Revision Committee.

Sheriffs' Standards Division Report

- No report. Autumn Hanna was unable to attend.

OTHER BUSINESS

Fitness Assessment (John Combs)

Fitness assessment video has been updated. Mrs. Fisher would like to revisit this as part of the approval of the curriculum changes we discussed with the Updated Cooper Institute forms. Mrs. Fisher turned the meeting over to Mr. John Combs for discussion.

Fitness assessment video was redone as a means to streamline and simplify it. The only portions that were shown are the required portions of the Coopers recommendations for the law enforcement fitness protocol. Committee recommends eliminating the third video (the much older one) regarding specified exercises.

Video was played.

While performing pushups, participants may opt to use the four-inch foam block versus the fist.

The mile and half run times are rough on all individuals, regardless of age. The numbers were calculated based upon data gathered from patients and individuals from the Cooper Clinic, from heart patients to pro-athletes since 1970. The amount of individuals in the database, we have been talking about potentially, in the future, starting to use a database comprised of just law enforcement officers across North Carolina; using our own norms from individuals that we test. This method is used by Charlotte-Mecklenburg and has proven to be a great idea. School directors will be receiving documentation requesting data to build the database. Currently, the Cooper Institute's norms, which are the general public, are one of the strongest bases to use at the moment. In the documentation, it says the norms are based upon the Cooper Clinic patients.

***Question:** The videos able to get from the Justice Academy?*

Response: Yes, it will replace the existing Physical Fitness video. Mr. Combs added that they recommended removing that particular video for a couple reasons; it is 20-years old, and has exercises and protocols that are outdated. Mrs. Fisher noted the videos to be removed are the aerobic exercise, weight lifting, and the stretching videos; and add two new videos, POPAT and Fitness Assessment videos, that were viewed at this meeting. And they are reflected in the draft of the lesson plan that was previously sent to the committee members.

Jeffrey Robinson made a **motion** to accept the video changes. Mack Creson **seconded**. **Motion carried.**

Future Meeting Dates/Locations

➤ October 10, 2014 – Morehead City Police Department, Morehead City, NC

Adjournment

Jason Godwin made a **motion** that the meeting be adjourned. Jeffrey Robinson **seconded**. **Motion carried.** Meeting adjourned at 12:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Janet Dunn
Program Assistant
North Carolina Justice Academy

Date:

July 28, 2014